

United States Patent and Trademark Office

mI

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/697,306	9/697,306 10/27/2000		James F. McGuckin JR.	10546/53003	4213	
30636	7590	02/17/2004		EXAMINER		
FAY KAPLUN & MARCIN, LLP				DAWSON, GLENN K		
150 BROAT NEW YORI				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•			3761	19	
				DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/697,306	MCGUCKIN, JAMES F.
Advicery Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Glenn K Dawson	3761
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover she t with the c	correspondenc address
THE REPLY FILED 06 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice i) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	statutory period for reply originally set in onths after the mailing date of the final reje	the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in ection, even if timely filed, may reduce any
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);
(b) \(\subseteq they raise the issue of new matter (see Note because of the content of t	• .	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying th
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejections.		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: 49-51.		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>36-48</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	•
10. Other:		M Glenn K Dawson
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3761

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Kuramoto discloses a tissue grabber. A tissue grabber is something that has the ability to grab tissue. Kuramoto's forceps 150 grabs tissue by grabbing the anvil. However, as the examiner has previously pointed out, the forceps 150 as shown in fig. 25 has the ability to move laterally or could easily grab tissue extending just distal to annular section 124. In either event, the forceps 150 could "grab tissue" which is all that is necessary to meet the claim limitations as the limitations reciting the grasping of the fold of tissue is purely functional in nature. Also functional in nature is the recitation that some part of the device extend out a natural orifice of the patient. If some portion of the device could be placed in the claimed orientation, then the prior art meets this limitation. As outlined in the previous office action, once the combination is made, this orientation could be achieved. Tsuruta, while stating that forceps are not required, would be enhanced by providing such to make the device more adaptable and therefore better equipped to be more useful in different situations. One skilled in the art when faced with a problem of how to make a rigid stapler flexible using the recited flexible components would have had no problem making the required alterations, given that flexible endoscopic instruments had been known for many years. The applicant appears to argue the references individually rather than the combination. The examiner contends that there is sufficient motivation to make the combination, and that once made, the combination teaches all of the claim limitations and can perform all of the claimed functions.